



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

their names and the University name to be freely used. Various professors expended much time and effort on their courses in Evelyn, and continued to do so, though generally failing to receive the small stipend which was promised them. Certain University officers, both faculty and trustees, served on the Evelyn board, but resigned because they could not approve of the way the institution was financially managed. Seeing that Evelyn College was closed only after the patience of everybody in Princeton, from tradesmen to trustees, was tried to the utmost, and the courtesies of the authorities strained to the breaking point, it is necessary that such a misstatement of the facts should be corrected." These facts do not apparently relieve Princeton University from the responsibility of being the only considerable university in the world that does not provide in any way for the higher education of women.

DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE.

BEHRING SEA CONFERENCES.

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: I have read with great interest the article on the results of the Behring Sea conferences, published in your number of November 26th (SCIENCE, N. S., Vol. VI., p. 781), which puts forward what is, I believe, the view of the 'seal question' held by most naturalists in every country in a clear and temperate manner. I venture to point out to you that more than four years ago I endeavored to place the question in a somewhat similar light before the British public in an article entitled 'A Naturalist's View of the Fur-Seal Question,' published in *The Nineteenth Century* for June, 1893, Vol. XXXIII., p. 1038). I beg leave to add an extract from this article in order to show the conclusions to which I had then arrived: "The absolute prohibition of 'pelagic' sealing which is demanded by the Americans, and which out to be carried out in order to ensure the continued existence of the fur-seals, can only be obtained by mutual arrangement among the parties interested. The fur-seal of Alaska (practically now the only remaining members of the group of fur-seals) should be declared to be, to all intents and purposes, a domestic animal, and its capture abso-

lutely prohibited except in its home on the Pribilof Islands. Looking to the great value of the privilege thus obtained, America might well consent to pay to Great Britain and her colonists some compensation for the loss of the right of 'pelagic' sealing; the amount of this compensation would be fairly based upon the number of fur-seals annually killed upon the Pribilof Islands. The 'royalty' thus levied would no doubt increase the price of seal-skin jackets. But seal-skin jackets are not a necessary luxury, and an additional pound added to their cost would not be of material consequence to the ladies who wear them. As a naturalist, therefore, I think that the fur-seal should be considered in the light of a domestic animal, and that all 'pelagic' sealing should be stopped, while the owners of the sealeries should at the same time pay to the other nations interested a reasonable compensation for the valuable privileges thus obtained."

P. L. SCLATER.

3, HANOVER SQUARE, LONDON, W.

December 15, 1897.

THE ENCHANTED MESA.

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: Referring to your postscript to my letter written in response to a communication to SCIENCE by Professor Libbey, I take the liberty of saying that, as the gentleman mentioned has *not* stated positively that *he* erected the stone monument on the summit of the Enchanted Mesa, one must reach such a conclusion only by inference. My reasons for not accepting anything short of a statement couched in unmistakable terms are based on what Professor Libbey has already contributed to the literature of the Enchanted Mesa. In the first place (*Princeton Press*, July 31) he says:

"No traces of former inhabitants were found. Further, no altars or traces of prayer sticks were found. * * * Not the slightest trace was found which would enable me to believe that a human foot had *ever before passed* over the top of this famous rock."

Again (*Princeton Press*, August 21) he says:

"For two hours I walked over the surface of the rock. * * * It is a splendid site for a pueblo, if some means of access could be de-

vised, but it could not have been freer of all traces of former occupation if it had been thoroughly swept up the day before. Only once was it that a doubt crossed my mind, when I came across a cairnlike monument which looked as though it might have been constructed by human hands. But the possibility of its being the result of erosion is also quite as strong as the other. No bits of pottery, no broken household utensils of any sort, no traces of construction of any sort were visible, not even the deepening of the natural surface of any of the rock cavities for the purpose of rain-water storage for drinking use, betrayed even the slightest indication that the top of the Mesa had ever been the prehistoric home of the Acomas."

In *Harper's Weekly* (August 28) Professor Libbey makes the following statement:

"There were no remnants of pottery, or fragments of household utensils, or implements of any kind; no water-tanks for the storage of rain water; one object alone looked as though it might have been built by human hands, and that was a small cairnlike mass of stones."

In this article Professor Libbey pictures the operation of his gun, boatswain's chair, etc.; but where is the 'cairnlike mass of stones' which he found, the origin of which he seems to be at such a loss to determine? It seems to me that this doubtful feature is the most important of all the observations made by Professor Libbey during his brief stay on the summit, and yet he left it unphotographed.

Later, in the *Philadelphia Press* (October 10), Professor Libbey says:

"The cairn-like pile of rocks, which I am glad Mr. Hodge so clearly decides is a cairn, is possibly the best proof of a mere visit, for even primitive people are not given to building cairns in their back yards. * * * *

"I am inclined from the facts which I was able to observe upon the top of the Mesa *still* (!) to believe that while the top may have been visited, no evidence exists at present of its ever having been permanently inhabited.

"I picked up some fragments which resembled ancient pottery, but could not persuade myself that they were. I took them to Mr. Pearce [one of the reporters who accompanied

Professor Libbey], and he agreed with me that they were not pottery."

The fact that the Professor fails to speak of having occupied part of his precious two hours in the erection of the lichen-covered rock-pile which we found and photographed, and the fact also that the structure occurs on a spot so protected from the surface wash that it may have stood there for ages, were sufficient to mislead anyone, and my error may be regarded as acknowledged when Professor Libbey states openly that the monument was erected by himself.

The better part of two days of research by the members of my party, each of whom had his eyes open, failed to reveal any other artificial monument than the one which I have figured. I am, therefore, safe in concluding that there is no ground whatever for the belief that any other artificial cairn or cairn-like structure exists on the summit of the Enchanted Mesa. If Professor Libbey constructed the cairn referred to, then he might have spent the portion of the two hours consumed by its erection in a way more profitable to archæology. Whether or not it was erected by him, the evidence of the former occupancy of the summit of the Enchanted Mesa is not weakened in the slightest degree.

F. W. HODGE.

BUREAU OF AMERICAN ETHNOLOGY,
WASHINGTON, December 14, 1897.

LAMARCK AND THE 'PERFECTING TENDENCY.'

IN preparing some lectures on the history of evolution theories I have come across a curious difference of opinion among distinguished writers. Professor Osborn ('From the Greeks to Darwin,' p. 163) seems to contradict himself in the same paragraph. He says: "Lamarck believes that we see in nature a certain natural order imposed by its Author, which is manifested in the successive development of life; we thus study natural forces and nature abandoned to its laws. In this sense we see nature creating and developing without cessation towards higher and higher types. External conditions do not alter this order of development, but give it infinite variety by directing the scale of being into an infinite number of branches."